

# GRAUSTARK

#41

"Spring 1909"

6 December 1964

## OTTOMAN VICTORIES FROM ARCTIC TO SAHARA

ENGLAND: F Edi-North Sea; F Norwegian Sea S F Edi-North Sea; F Hel-Hol; F North Atlantic-Clyde; A Den-Swe.

FRANCE: A Mar-Pie; F Spa-Wes; F Mid-North Atlantic; F Iri S F Mid-North Atlantic; F North Sea-Edi; A Yor S F North Sea-Edi; F Hol-North Sea; A Kie holds; A Man & A Ber S A Kie; A Nor-Swe; F Fre-Eng.

ITALY: No moves received.

TURKEY: F Ion-Tun; F Nap-Rom; F Eas-Ion; F Aeg S F Eas-Ion; A Alb-Tri; A Ser S A Alb-Tri; A Bud S A Vie; A Vie holds; A War-Pru; A Sil S A War-Pru; A Bul-Rum; A Mos-St.P; A Ank-Arm.

The Italian army in Trieste is dislodged and, since no Italian moves were received, annihilated. Underlined moves are not possible. The deadline for Fall 1909 moves is SATURDAY 19 DECEMBER 1964.

This is

There are still openings available in the postal Diplomacy game which will begin in GRAUSTARK as soon as this game, 1964A, ends. Send your \$2.00 entry fee to John Boardman, 532 16th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11218. This fee entitles you to all issues of GRAUSTARK published during the progress of the game.

O At  
P Great  
E Interval  
R This  
A Appears  
T To  
I Inflame  
O Optic  
N Nerves

This issue of GRAUSTARK carries an article "A Case for the Triple Alliance", another of the series on Diplomacy strategy which included the publisher's "What Good is Austria-Hungary" in GRAUSTARK #38. The author of this issue's article is General Cielya Toetruck, Chief of the Liberian General Staff. Gen. Toetruck is an unfortunate individual who can lose in any winning situation. The General is famed for his disaster at Hedumbo where three pygmies destroyed the First Division, President's Own, commanded by Toetruck. Gen. Toetruck is known as the first man to shoot his toe off with a German Mauser.

# 114

## A CASE FOR THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE

I write this article, if these few words deserve the title, in an attempt to clarify my own thoughts and to create comment as to the problems facing Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Italy. These Great Powers are what I prefer to call "Middle Powers". Middle Powers because they face the likelihood of a two-front war. In fact, Austria-Hungary must base her strategy on the premise that she will be required to fight the Turk in the Balkans and the Italians along the Isonzo River. So my thesis is, the Middle Powers must ally if they hope to survive, let alone win.

Let me begin by commenting on what I believe to be the situation facing each of the Middle Powers. Austria-Hungary is surrounded by a

wealth of "convenient" supply centers - convenient in the sense that in order to capture the supply center it is not necessary to take a large number of provinces or seas which do not contain supply centers. Even as she is blessed with neutral supply centers, Austria-Hungary, plagued by potential enemies to the North, South, East, and West, can not consider any border safe. But her very location can be her salvation. Austria-Hungary stands watch over the Eastern Marches. She is the only Great Power positioned to thwart Turkish expansion. As long as Turkey remains a threat to Christian Europe, Italy and Russia dare not dismember the Habsburgs' Empire. For the Balkans to fall into the hands of Turkey would be a major setback for Italian and Russian diplomacy. If Turkey captures Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, and Budapest, Turkey will become a "Super Power" fully capable of dealing with Russia and Italy. Therefore, it is to the best interest of both Italy and Russia to permit Austria-Hungary to exist as a buffer state, and time is all Austria needs. Given three or four years, the Austrian Empire should be powerful enough to withstand the onslaught of Italy or Russia.

Italy is confronted with a dilemma. To attack Austria-Hungary places her across the path of the expanding Turkish Empire, which by this time would be a Super Power. In fact, Italy, when she succeeds in destroying Austria, inherits the unhappy fate of the Habsburgs. Only, the Italian player must seek a solution for stopping a Super Power, and unfortunately for Italy, the solution usually requires Italy to leave her Western borders open to French incursions. But all "convenient" supply centers are to the East. For Italy to go to war with France means a rather long campaign before any supply centers are captured, and long campaigns without immediate reward are very dangerous. It goes without saying, for Italy to attempt Munich, though very flashy, is courting with disaster. Perhaps Italy's best policy is to wait at least one year. If it appears that France, allied with England, will take Germany - attack France. If Turkey is being defeated by an Austro-Russian coalition and if France is being pressed by Germany, England, or both - hit Austria-Hungary. Of course the strategy will be tempered by the situation, but the above is only a generalization.

Surrounded by a host of convenient supply centers and enough potential rivals to make survival most difficult, Germany's position is similar to Austria-Hungary. Also like Austria, Germany has a natural enemy, France. Only if England is most inept in her foreign policy will Germany and France ally. As if Germany did not have enough troubles along her Western border, she must contend with Russia in the North and to the East. Therefore, Germany's diplomacy is straightforward; she must prevent England, France, and Russia from forming an alliance. Again, like Austria-Hungary, Germany is blessed with a critical location. She is the only country that can prevent France from exploding into Central Europe - something Russia and Austria-Hungary would want to prevent at all costs. So, it would seem natural for Austria and Russia to remain on good terms with Germany until these powers had satisfactorily settled the Turkish problem.

To sum up my argument, Austria-Hungary's reflex move into the Balkans generally entangles her with Turkey and later Russia. The first four years should see Austria and Russia allied against Turkey. But these two powers could very quickly become involved over the spoils. Besides, Austria's long border with Russia would make disengagement, let alone trust, very difficult. It is not "good" policy to

leave your back open to attack; therefore the Austrian player would always wonder when the Russian would break the peace. Whereas Austria's borders with Russia are long and difficult to police, her frontier with Italy can be secured with two armies and two fleets.

Even though the convenient supply centers are to the East, Italy will find it convenient to move on France. Early in the game, Austria-Hungary and Russia will be engaged in eliminating Turkey and later each other. Therefore, the Italian player will have at least four years to gain control of the Western Mediterranean and the surrounding land masses. Given the assistance of Germany, Italy should have little trouble in driving the French from Marseilles and the Iberian Peninsula. It will be necessary for Italy to protect herself against Austrian adventures, but two armies and one fleet should provide enough security. Therefore, it seems natural for Italy and Austria-Hungary to ally.

Germany's expansion into the Lowlands and her problems of defending Munich are excuse enough to cause Germany to go to war with France. Therefore, Italy and Germany have good cause to consider a coalition. And after the demise of France, the coalition would always have England to contend with. I discount the possibility of ever Germany and Austria-Hungary going to war. They just do not have the convenient supply centers to fight over. Besides, there is always Russia.

The main problem of the Middle Powers is the threat of the two-front war. If there is an alliance of the three Middle Powers, I have tried to prove that there would be no conflict over spheres of influence. I think that it is obvious that the alliance would eliminate the two-front war for Italy and Austria-Hungary. Germany would still be faced by the threat of Russia, but I hope that I have proven sufficiently, that Russia can be handled by the Triple Alliance. The only wonder is, why haven't we seen one?

\*

Comments on the above article, as well as further articles on Diplomacy strategy, are solicited from the readership. For the new Diplomacy fan who wishes to catch up on the discussion, back issues of GRAUSTARK from #15 and FREDONIA from #1 are available at 5¢ each. Subscriptions to these bulletins of postal Diplomacy are 10 issues for \$1.00 from John Boardman, 592 16th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 11218. Other postal Diplomacy fanzines are:

Ruritania; Dave McDaniel, Apt. #4, 619 South Hobart Street, Los Angeles, California 90005

Brobdingnag; Dick Schultz, 19159 Helen, Detroit, Michigan 48234.

Trantor; John W. Smythe Jr., 621 East Prospect, Girard, Ohio

Wild & Woolly; Dan Brannon, Apt. #5, 106 South Edgemont, Los Angeles, California 90004.

All bulletins are 10 issues for \$1, except for Wild & Woolly, which is 20 issues for \$1. The publishers of Ruritania and Wild & Woolly are currently organizing new postal Diplomacy games. In addition, Dave McDaniel and Dick Schultz are compiling directories of persons interested in postal Diplomacy and would like to know your name and address if this category includes you.